

**REMARKS**

This patent application presently includes claims 2, 4, 5-18 and 20, of which claims 5-18 have been withdrawn from consideration, claims 2 and 4 stand rejected, and claim 20 is newly added. Claims 2 and 4 are rewritten in independent form without amendment, and all rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected as anticipated by Sato Patent Number 6,262,507. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It should be noted that claims 2 and 4, in the last subparagraph, define a structural relationship between permanent magnets and the rotor block (in the case of claim 2) and the relationship of the permanent magnets (in the case of claim 4) which is not even suggested by Sato. In fact, other than the bald statement in the first line at paragraph 2 (page 2) of the Office Action, the Examiner does not even mention the feature of claim 2 and does not even consider the structure of the magnets defined in claim 4. Moreover, the claimed structures achieve a distinct advantage in that the value (i.e., the actual value) of the cogging torque is decreased.

In contrast, Sato is merely concerned with the problem of variation in cogging torque caused by variation in the magnetic orientation of a magnet. That is, he is only concerned with decreasing the *variation* in cogging torque and not the actual value of the cogging torque. Thus, Sato does not teach or suggest the claimed invention and would not obtain the benefits resulting therefrom. Accordingly, claims 2 and 4 are not thought or even suggested by Sato and are allowable there over.

Claim 19 was rejected as obvious over Sato in view of the Dokonal et al. US Patent Number 6,380,654. The Examiner merely sites Dokonal for its disclosure of rotor having magnets produced by magnetizing the rotor, by using the stator as a magnetic yoke after assembling the motor. However, Dokonal discloses nothing that would overcome the shortcomings of Sato as a reference against claims 2 and 4. That is, Dokonal discloses nothing that would teach or suggest the structural relationships defined in the last subparagraph of claim 2 or claim 4. Accordingly, claims

2 and 4 distinguish patentably over the combination of Sato and Dokonal and are allowable thereover.

Claim 20 depends from claim 2 and is allowable based upon its dependence from an allowable claim. It is noted that the cancellation of claim 19 and submission of claim 20 should not be considered an amendment for a purpose related to the statutory requirements for patentability. Claim 20 depends from an allowable claim and is allowable, because substantively any claim dependent from an allowable claim is also allowable.

For all of the reasons stated above, all of the claims presently in this application are in condition for allowance.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore, honestly requested that this patent application, as a whole, receive further for reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any unanswered questions, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's undersigned attorney and the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: May 6, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph B. Lerch  
Joseph B. Lerch

Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant